## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MELVIN DUKES,

No. C 09-03918 SBA (PR)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CONTINUED INTENT TO PROSECUTE THIS ACTION

 $\mathbf{V}$ 

WARDEN OF SALINAS VALLEY STATE PRISON.

Defendant.

Plaintiff filed the instant <u>pro se</u> civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, and in an Order dated August 19, 2009, Magistrate Judge Craig M. Kellison of the Eastern District transferred this action to this Court. On August 26, 2009, the Clerk of the Court informed Plaintiff that this case had been transferred to the Northern District.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), a district court may <u>sua sponte</u> dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with a court order. <u>See Link v. Wabash R.R.</u>, 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962); <u>McKeever v. Block</u>, 932 F.2d 795, 797 (9th Cir. 1991). But such a dismissal should only be ordered when the failure to comply is unreasonable. <u>See id.</u> A district court should afford the litigant prior notice of its intention to dismiss. <u>See Malone v. United States Postal Serv.</u>, 833 F.2d 128, 133 (9th Cir. 1987).

In the instant case, Plaintiff has failed to communicate with the Court since this case has been transferred to the Northern District. Furthermore, the August 26, 2009 notice was returned as undeliverable on September 3, 2009 with a notation: "Return to Sender -- Inmate Refused." Accordingly, it is in the interests of justice and judicial efficiency for the Court to establish whether Plaintiff intends to continue to prosecute this action. Plaintiff shall file a notice of his continued intent to prosecute no later than **thirty** (30) **days** of the date of this Order. Failure to do so will result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice for failure to prosecute under Rule 41(b) of

## Case 4:09-cv-03918-SBA Document 8 Filed 09/09/09 Page 2 of 3

For the Northern District of California

**United States District Court** 

the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. <u>See Malone</u>, 833 F.2d at 133 (the district court should afford the litigant prior notice before dismissing for failure to prosecute).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>9/4/09</u>

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTROM United States District Judge

P:\PRO-SE\SBA\CR.09\Dukes3918.41(b)-NOTICE.wpd

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 4	MELVIN DUKES,  Case Number: CV09-03918 SBA  Plaintiff,
5 6	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
7	WARDEN et al,
8	Defendant/
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
10	Court, Northern District of California.
11	That on September 9, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
12	envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.
13 14	
15	Melvin Dukes D-33572
16	Salinas Valley State Prison P.O. Box 1050 Soledad, CA 93960-1050
17	Dated: September 9, 2009
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk
19 20	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	